



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/750,489	12/26/2000	Alan T. Yaung	STL000044US1	5889

7590 10/30/2006
SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK, SEARS, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVE,NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, VAN H

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2194

DATE MAILED: 10/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/750,489

Applicant(s)

YAUNG, ALAN T.

Examiner

VAN H. NGUYEN

Art Unit

2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 August 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 and 37-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 and 37-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to the amendment filed 08/16/2006.

Claims 1-35 and 37-40 are currently pending in this application. Claim 40 has been added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 2 The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Specification does not explicitly describe nor is sufficiently clear for one of ordinary skill in art to recognize the feature “the second computer *connects to the same queue manager*” in claim 39 as amended by Applicant in the amendment filed 08/16/2006.

The Examiner could not locate the details of the feature "*the second computer connects to the same queue manager*" in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-35 and 37-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Microsoft Message Queuing Services (MSQS)**.

The reference was cited by the Examiner in the previous Office Action.

As to claim 1:

MSQS teaches the invention as claim including a method for communication (*e.g., communications, send, receive*) between a first computer (*e.g., applications may be running on ... separate machines*) and a second computer (*e.g., applications may be running on ... separate machines*), each of which is connected to a server computer (*e.g., Microsoft Message Queuing Server*) [*see the discussion beginning at page 4*], the method comprising:

- under control of a first client application (*e.g., when two applications want to communicate with each other using USMQ, one must act as a sender*) at the first computer (*e.g., applications may be running on... separate machines*), creating (*e.g., generate*) a message (*e.g., a message*), wherein the message comprises at least one out of a group of an event notification with zero text and zero content identifiers, a text message, and a content identifier (*e.g., see the MSMQ message discussion*); and putting the message into a message queue (*e.g., see the MSMQ queue discussion*); and
- under control of a second client application (*e.g., when two applications want to communicate with each other using USMQ, one must act as... a receiver*) at the second computer (*e.g., applications may be running on... separate machines*), retrieving the message from the message queue (*e.g., multiple applications to send messages to, and receive messages from, the same queue*).

As to claim 2:

MSQS teaches text comprises a string of alphanumeric characters [*see the discussion beginning at page 10*].

As to claim 3:

MSQS teaches a content identifier comprises an item identifier and a server name *[see the discussion beginning at page 8]*.

As to claim 4:

MSQS teaches the message comprises an event notification with zero text and zero content identifiers *[see the discussion beginning at page 8]*.

As to claim 5:

MSQS teaches the message comprises text with zero content identifiers *[see the discussion beginning at page 8]*.

As to claim 6:

MSQS teaches the message comprises zero text and one or more content identifiers that represent items in a data store connecting to the server computer *[see the discussion beginning at page 8]*.

As to claim 7:

MSQS teaches the message comprises an object *[see the discussion beginning at page 8]*.

As to claim 8:

MSQS teaches the message is put into the message queue via a method of a class *[see the discussion beginning at page 8]*.

As to claim 9:

MSQS teaches the message is retrieved from the message queue via a method of a class *[see the discussion beginning at page 8]*.

As to claim 10:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein in full. Additionally, MSQS further teaches a datastore management system *[see the discussion beginning at page 12]*.

As to claims 11-18:

Note the rejection of claims 2-9 above. Claims 11-18 are the same as claims 2-9, except claims 11-18 are apparatus claims and claims 2-9 are method claims.

As to claim 19:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein in full. Additionally, MSQS further teaches a datastore management system *[see the discussion beginning at page 12]*.

As to claims 20-27:

Note the rejection of claims 2-9 above. Claims 20-27 are the same as claims 2-9, except claims 20-27 are program storage medium claims and claims 2-9 are method claims.

As to claim 28:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein in full. Additionally, MSQS further teaches wherein when a body of the message comprises the text, the text is passed to the second application, when the body of the message comprises the content identifier, objects are forwarded to the second application, and when the body of a message comprises no the text and no the content identifiers the message is an event notification notifying the second application of an occurrence of an event *[see the discussion beginning at page 6]*.

As to claim 29:

MSQS teaches the content identifier identifies a search result of a search performed by the first application, and wherein the search result comprises at least one object stored in the at least one server computer *[see the discussion beginning at page 6]*.

As to claim 30:

MSQS teaches the system is a federated content management system *[see the discussion beginning at page 12]*.

As to claim 31:

MSQS teaches the first and second applications are client applications *[see the discussion beginning at page 6]*.

As to claim 32:

MSQS teaches the system is a distributed computing system and the server connects to at least one data storage *[see the discussion beginning at page 6]*.

As to claim 33:

MSQS teaches the first and the second computers execute portals for messaging between the first and second applications *[see the discussion beginning at page 8]*.

As to claim 34:

Refer to the discussion of claim 3 above for rejection.

As to claim 35:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein in full. Additionally, MSQS teaches the message comprises a text length value and a content identifier count value *[see the discussion beginning at page 6]*.

As to claim 37:

MSQS teaches when the text length value is zero and when the content identifier count value is zero, the message is an event notification *[see the discussion beginning at page 8]*.

As to claim 38:

MSQS teaches when the content identifier count value is greater than zero, the message further comprises at least one content identifier identifying an object from a heterogeneous storage *[see the discussion beginning at page 6]*.

As to claim 39:

MSQS teaches under the control of the first client application, the first computer connects to a queue manager (*e.g., queue manager*) located on the server computer and puts the message into the message queue, and wherein under the control of the second client application, the second computer connects to the same queue manager located on the server computer and retrieves the message from the message queue *[see the discussion beginning at page 6]*.

As to claim 40:

MSQS teaches the first computer, the second computer, and the server form part of a federated content management system and wherein the federated content management system further comprises heterogeneous servers *[see the discussion beginning at page 6]*.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 08/16/2006 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record, listed on PTO 892 provided to Applicant is considered to have relevancy to the claimed invention. Applicant should review each identified reference carefully before responding to this office action to properly advance the case in light of the prior art.

Contact Information

6. Any inquiry or a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: (571) 272-2100.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VAN H. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571)

Art Unit: 2194

272-3765. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30AM 6:00PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternative Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, WILLIAM THOMSON can be reached at (571) 272-3718.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for patents
P O Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450



Van H. Nguyen
Patent Examiner, AU 2194